



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,143	12/13/2001	Andrew C. Alduino	42390.P11010	6618
7590	09/16/2005		EXAMINER	
Charles K. Young BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			HUGHES, DEANDRA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/020,143	ALDUINO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Deandra M. Hughes	3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-45 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24-45 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 10/24/04 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 24-25, 27-29, 31-34, 37-39, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kasamatsu (US 6,288,833 filed Feb. 17, 2000).

With regard to claim 24, Kasamatsu discloses:

- a substrate (fig. 5, col. 3, line 32);
- a waveguide embedded within said substrate (#13), wherein an optical signal may propagate through said waveguide (col. 3, line 41);
- at least two or more light sources (#19) disposed on a first side (side with pump lasers #19) of said substrate along a length of said waveguide to emit light into said waveguide in *substantially* transverse (col. 3, line 35, 'width direction'; also waveguides 21 are *substantially* transverse) to a direction of propagation of the optical signal, the light emitted from said at least two or more light sources to pump the optical signal (col. 3, line 33);
- a reflector (112) disposed on a second side (side emitting 114) of said substrate to reflect at least a portion of light emitted from said at least two

or more light sources into said waveguide, the reflected light pump the optical signal.

With regard to claim 28, Kasamatsu discloses:

- a semiconductor substrate (col. 4, line 47 - silicon or quartz);
- a waveguide (#13) embedded within said semiconductor substrate through which an optical signal may propagate (col. 3, line 41);
- in a direction *substantially* transverse to a direction of propagation of the optical signal (col. 3, line 35, 'width direction'; also waveguides 21 are *substantially* transverse), the light emitted from said at least two or more semiconductor light sources to pump the optical signal (col. 3, line 33).

With regard to claims 25 and 29, the waveguide contains a rare-earth group ion (col. 3, line 33). Erbium (Er) is a well-known dopant for optical amplification. Further, Kasamatsu discloses Er as a rare-earth group ion (col. 4, line 66).

With regard to claims 27, 31, 37, and 41, 980nm and 1480nm are well-known wavelengths for pumping Er-doped fiber amplifiers in the 1.55 micron optical signal range. Further, these wavelengths are disclosed (e.g., col. 1, line 60).

With regard to claims 32, 38, and 42, the reflector and the substrate would inherently have a different refractive index. In particular, the mounting substance of the mirror would inherently have a different refractive index than that of the substrate.

With regard to claims 33-34 and 39, Kasamatsu discloses:

- a semiconductor substrate (col. 4, line 47 - silicon or quartz);

- a waveguide (#13) embedded within said semiconductor substrate through which an optical signal may propagate (col. 3, line 41);
- said waveguide being doped with erbium (col. 4, line 66);
- at least two or more semiconductor light sources (#19: each source is an array; col. 8, lines 10-16) disposed on a first side of said substrate (side with pump lasers #19) along a length of said waveguide *in a direction substantially transverse to a direction of propagation of the optical signal* (col. 3, line 35, 'width direction'; also waveguides 21 are *substantially transverse*), to emit light into said waveguide, the light emitted from said at least two or more semiconductor light sources to pump the optical signal, wherein at least two of said at least two or more semiconductor light sources are disposed within a single light source substrate (the semiconductor laser bar is on a single substrate).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 26, 30, 36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasamatsu (US 6,288,833 filed Feb. 17, 2000) in view of Lange (US filed Feb. 16, 2001). Kasamatsu does not specifically disclose that the pump light sources are vertical cavity emitting lasers (VCSELs). However, Lange teaches

transverse pumping (87) of a waveguide embedded in a substrate by a VCSEL (74; col. 5, line 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., an optical engineer) to use a VCSEL to pump the waveguide embedded in a substrate for the advantage of lower cost components, as is taught by Lange (col. 5, line 56).

5. Claims 35 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasamatsu (US 6,288,833 filed Feb. 17, 2000) in view of Lawrence (US 6,289,027 filed Sep. 11, 2001).

Kasamatsu does not specifically disclose pumping a waveguide in a direction that is perpendicular to the propagation of the optical signal. However, Lawrence teaches orthogonal pumping (#60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., an optical engineer) to orthogonally pump the waveguide for the advantage of minimizing signal reflection at the interface.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. The information disclosure statement filed 06/23/05 has been considered.

***Drawings***

7. A replacement drawing sheet depicting figures 4-5 and 10 was submitted with the amendment dated 10/25/04. This replacement sheet is objected to because it introduces a new figure 5 that is substantially different from the previous figure 5. Further, figure 10 is introduced but the specification does not address this figure. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version

of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Conclusion***

8. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/020,143. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Further, the arguments have been addressed (see Action dated 01/14/05 and Advisory dated 5/10/05). Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deandra M. Hughes whose telephone number is 571-272-6982. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Deandra M. Hughes  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3663